DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 710 HE 002 338

AUTHOR	Young, Kenneth E.
TITLE	Access to Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	26 Apr 71
NOTE	66p.; Background paper prepared for a national project of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Admission Criteria, *College Admission, *Higher Education, Open Enrollment, *Student Characteristics, *Universal Education

ABSTRACT

This paper identifies some manifestations of "access" and also examines certain barriers to college admittance that have been significant in the past and, in certain instances, continue to the present. Accordingly, the first section traces the history of enrollment growth and notes that: (1) access to given institutions of higher education has changed, whereby many colleges and universities have altered their program emphasis or changed their admission standards; (2) access to various types of institutions of higher education has evolved into certain recognizable patterns; and (3) certain groups have experienced more difficulty than others in gaining access to higher education and access throughout history has been related to certain student characteristics: age, sex, race, religion, place of residence, socioeconomic status, and educational preparation. Section 2 of the paper deals with each of these characteristics as they have affected access. Appendix A discusses the structure of higher education as it relates to access and outlines the major changes in structure that have taken place. Appendix B deals with changes in the student population in higher education in the last 2 1/2 centuries in terms of age, sex, race, religion, place of residence, socioeconomic status, and educational preparation. (AF)

ED052710

ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION

A Background Paper Prepared for AASCU's National Project

by

Kenneth E. Young

April 26, 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 002 337

> ". . .In a nation that speaks of inalienable rights, the right to learn must be paramount. Yet that right, in its full meaning, has been denied to many in this nation. It has been denied because of color, religion, poverty, infirmity, and residence. And it has been denied because of our often mindless adherence to many unproductive teaching concepts and practices."
>
> -- John I. Goodlad

"Access," according to the dictionary, is the "act or privilege of coming to; admittance; approach." This, then, represents something different from, less than, "opportunity." Warren W. Willingham makes this point in his recent book, Free-Access Higher Education:

> ". . .accessibility is by no means equivalent to opportunity. An accessible institution provides opportunity only if it offers programs of appropriate quality, serves the community, attracts students, and effectively meets their needs. Meeting student and community needs raises a wide variety of questions concerning the relevance of higher education -- questions that are imbedded in major social issues and carry far-reaching implications for students, faculty, and institutions. Thus, accessibility is a necessary but insufficient condition to the existence of opportunity for higher education."

To discuss fully the implications of "equal opportunity for higher education" would require much more space than that provided for this document and would unnecessarily invade the domains of other background papers. This paper, then, will not wrestle with such enticing and important questions as: "Access to What?" "Does Open Door Mean Revolving Door?" or "Should Everyone Go to College?" Rather, this paper will attempt to identify certain important manifestations of "access." It also will take a look at certain obstacles or barriers to college-going that have loomed large in the past

and that, in certain instances, continue to present problems for some large segments of society.

More than anything else, the story of access to American higher education is told in two dramatic developments -- events that have occurred at no other place and in no other time in history:

(1) Higher education has drastically changed (grown and diversified) in structure/function over the years. (See Appendix A.)

(2) Access to higher education also has changed (greatly broadened) during the same period. (See Appendix B.)

The accompanying shift in society's attitudes has seen the role of higher education evolve from providing education for the upper classes, to education for an academic elite, to education for all those aspiring to a broad range of degree-requiring occupations, to education for all who desire it and hopefully will profit from it. The striking results of this development are shown in the reports of enrollment statistics.

HISTORY OF ENROLLMENT GROWTH

According to various estimates, the number of college students in the seventeenth century totaled fewer than 600; the 14 "important colleges" in 1790 had a reported enrollment of 872; and the 12 New England colleges had an average of 1,560 students in 1830 up to 1,884 in 1850. The first comparative data on American college and university enrollments begin with the year 1869-70. They indicate a sudden upsurge in college attendance beginning about 1885.

Professor Guide H. Marx charted this increase in numbers and concluded:

"Each chart shows a practically uniform attendance until

> about 1885 and then a sharp upward bend maintained with essential uniformity. It is remarkable that institutions differing widely in their nature and separated by thousands of miles geographically should experience simultaneously this thrill of rebirth. . .an institution not to have been affected by this broad, fundamental movement must have definitely turned its back upon the demand of the times and refused to open its gates to an awakening people."

Except for a slight falling off in the wartime years of 1917-18, 1943-46, and 1951-52, and a temporary decline during the Depression, student enrollments have steadily climbed -- from 115,817 or .23 percent of the population in 1879-80, to 7,484,073 or 3.68 percent of the population in the fall of 1969.

POPULATION AND STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION*

1869-70 through Fall 1969

Year	Population		Student Enrollment in Higher Education		
	Total	Ages 18-21	Number	% Population	% 18-21
1869-70	39,818,449	3,116,000	52,286	.13	1.68
1879-80	50,155,783	4,253,000	115,817	.23	2.72
1889-90	62,947,714	5,160,000	156,756	.25	3.04
1899-1900	75,994,575	5,931,000	237,592	.31	4.01
1909-10	90,492,000	6,934,000	355,213	.39	5.12
1919-20	104,512,000	7,386,000	597,880	.57	8.09
1929-30	121,770,000	8,862,000	1,100,737	.90	12.42
1939-40	131,028,000	9,582,000	1,494,203	1.14	15.59
1949-50	149,188,000	8,990,000	2,659,021	1.78	29.58
1st Term 1959	177,830,000	9,190,000	3,215,544	1.81	34.99
1st Term 1969	203,419,000	14,199,000	7,484,073	3.68	52.88

*from Digest of Educational Statistics, National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1970.

As Eric Ashby has shown, if enrollments in American colleges and universities since about 1885 are plotted on logarithmic paper, the result is a straight line. This trend is not likely to continue, however. College enrollments increased about four million in the ten years 1960-70, over eight percent per year. In the next 30 years, 1970-2000, though, the increase will probably amount to only five or six million, less than two percent per year.

Within the broad sweep of this historic development, however, certain other changes also were occurring:

(1) Access to given institutions of higher education has changed (usually narrowed) to the extent that many colleges and universities have altered their program emphases or raised their admissions standards. (The gradual transformation of the land-grant institutions serves as the most striking example of this.)

(2) Access to various types of institutions of higher education has evolved into certain recognizable patterns. As Douglas M. Knight has pointed out, our "system" of higher education is not so much a system as it is an astonishing number of institutions that look like members of a system as we group them by type, size, and educational mandate (for example, AASCU member institutions). To some extent, students tend to sort themselves by socioeconomic level among these various types of institutions.

(3) Certain groups within our society have experienced greater difficulty in gaining access to higher education. Throughout history, admission to college has been related to a variety of student characteristics -- the major ones being age, sex, race, religion, place of residence, socioeconomic status, and educational preparation.

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS AND ACCESS

During the period of the Old American College (1636-1885), students were fairly young (with some exceptions), all men, predominantly white, mostly of the Protestant faiths, generally of the upper-middle class, usually from the immediate surroundings and largely selected in terms of ability in the verbal studies. With the expansion and diversification of the functions and structure of higher education that occurred after 1885 came a corresponding expansion and diversification in student personnel. Women, Negroes, Roman Catholics, Jews, students from the lower-middle class, and youths from different regions with different kinds of educational preparation and with different abilities and career objectives swarmed into colleges and universities. (For a fuller description, see Appendix B.)

This "process of democratization," however, is far from complete. Some of the continuing problems include the following:

Age:

"The very term 'college-age population' is exclusionary," the recent Newman Report asserted. "It implies that young people ought to be engaged in higher education from about age 18 (although nearly half are not). It also implies that the older students should be seen as atypical -- that they are trespassing on campuses where they don't belong." (The Report noted that older students are served in many institutions through some kind of program of continuing education but that these programs are generally relegated to third class status.)

As in other cases of apartheid, the Report observed, segregation by age not only affects those who are excluded; the segregationists also are deprived.

> "Everything we know about education suggests that teaching and learning are strongly conditioned by peers -- that the attitudes and knowledge of students are formed as much outside class as in. Partly for this reason, colleges go through elaborate admissions procedures to select students who are not only able, but balanced in terms of regional, ethnic and social backgrounds. Yet in no case we know of is age a factor. Socially, colleges and universities serve to separate -- not integrate -- the generations in American life."

Sex:

Comparisons of the participation of men and women in higher education reveal a continuing unequal pattern:

(1) Although in high school, women earn better grades and test scores than men, fewer enter college.

(2) The proportion of 18- and 19-year-old males enrolled in higher education increased 20 percent between 1950 and 1960, but the participation of females increased only 11 percent.

This picture is complicated by several other factors, however. Girls seem to profit from the female-dominated environments of the home and school, which helps to account for their better grades and test scores. And societal attitudes about the role of women affect their decisions and their drive. The Newman Report attacks the "ingrained assumptions and inhibitions on the part of both men and women which deny the talents and aspirations of the latter."

Colleges that practice selectivity based primarily on high school grades and test scores face a particular dilemma. Women candidates will qualify in much greater numbers than men applicants, but on the average will not perform as well over the four years of college.

Race:

Black students continue to receive the greatest amount of attention among

minority groups because they represent the largest numbers. Black student enrollment in higher education increased considerably from 1964 (234,000) to 1969 (492,000). However, Black enrollment as a percentage of total enrollment actually declined from 1964 (5.0 percent) to 1966 (4.7 percent) and since has been gradually rising (to 6.6 percent in 1969). Although Black students constitute almost 12 percent of the college-age population, they still represent only 6.6 percent of college students. And, until very recently, about half the Black students were attending predominantly Black colleges.

Although accurate figures are difficult to come by, evidence indicates similar continuing statistical gaps in representation among the college population for other minority groups, particularly the Chicanos and the American Indians. The exceptions would be the Chinese and the Japanese, who attend college in greater numbers than the general population.

Place of residence:

Residential status, as an influencing factor in college attendance, is becoming more important as public institutions increase the difference between in-state and out-of-state tuition and state legislatures establish quotas for out-of-state students (as at the University of Colorado).

Willingham and others have pointed out that proximity of a college to a student's place of residence has become a key element in the accessibility of higher education. Several studies have indicated that the existence of a low-cost nonselective college increases the rate of college attendance in the immediate area. Willingham found that there is a "serious deficiency" of accessible higher education (meaning institutions that accept most high-school graduates and charge no more than $400 in annual tuition) in 23 of the

29 largest metropolitan areas in the country. The educational opportunity of three-fifths of the population is "inhibited" because no accessible college is nearby. Willingham found the urban Northeast to be most deficient. The West has the most accessible colleges and the highest rate of college attendance, but it is the only region where the major central cities have less accessible higher education than their fringe areas. A high proportion of the South is covered by free-access colleges, though segregation of institutions makes some of that accessibility illusory. A smaller proportion of Midwesterners live near a free-access college than is true of any other region.

It is a conservative estimate that each year more than 500,000 youths do not continue education beyond high school simply because they happen not to live near an accessible college. Approximately 85 percent of students attend college within their own state.

Willingham also found that access to college varied by the type or level of higher education. The vast majority of the public two-year colleges accept all or virtually all high school graduates. There are now about 1100 such institutions, and they constitute three-quarters of the free-access group (as defined by Willingham). Three of ten public four-year colleges and universities qualify as relatively free-access institutions.

Of those colleges that are not considered free-access, about 500 are special purpose or heavily religious. The remaining 1300 or so are inaccessible in roughly equal measure because of cost or selectivity, but more often both. Private institutions, of course, produce selectivity in varying degrees. Recent developments seem to indicate that many smaller financially troubled private colleges may be moving rapidly toward "open door" status.

Touching on another aspect of the effect of place of residence on college attendance, Robert N. O'Neill, in Higher Education for Everybody?, has pointed out that:

> ". . .while private universities have quite consciously become more diverse in matters of geographical representation, the public institutions -- equally consciously if often involuntarily -- are becoming more provincial. There are, of course, other reasons why public systems have become more local in character: the disproportionate increase in enrollments at junior and community colleges, to which most students commute, and the late but rapid growth of public campuses in the traditional 'exploiting' states of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. But the central fact remains: the geographical mobility of students who cannot pay private college tuitions or claim large scholarships has been drastically curtailed by the building of high walls in the form of tuition and grade-point differentials and strict nonresident quotas. The inevitable effect of these protectionist policies is to deprive both in-state and out-of-state students of opportunities for association that would measurably enhance the college experience and the quality of the institution. Meanwhile, the paramount educational concerns of the most state legislators -- campus unrest and high costs -- will assuredly push these walls higher in the next five to ten years."

Socioeconomic status:

Socioeconomic status also continues to be a major factor in college-going. Several years ago Christopher Jencks observed that among high school students from the bottom socioeconomic quartile who also ranked in the top academic bracket, only one in four could expect to attend college. The prognosis has improved somewhat in the late 1960's, but the correlation between wealth and access remains high. Of those who are excluded from higher education for non-academic reasons, of course, a disproportionate share belongs to racial and ethnic minorities.

The strong relationship between socioeconomic status and college-going perhaps rests as much on social attitudes as on financial considerations. As Ralph F. Berdie explains:

> "Whether or not a high school graduate attends college depends in large part upon the home from which he comes. The attitudes of the family toward things related to education, as shown by the books and magazines in the home, the community organizations in which the family is represented, and the education of the parents, are perhaps even more important than the family's financial resources. Children learn from their parents' attitudes that may determine whether they want to attend college. Obviously, if more qualified high school graduates are to attend college, any program of action must take into consideration the influence exerted by the family. Any program if it is to be effective in increasing the number of qualified students who attend college must attempt to influence the attitudes of both parents and students, as well as to reduce the economic barriers."

Academic ability:

American higher education has always emphasized literary or verbal talent as a requirement for admission. This emphasis first manifested itself in the form of pre-college course requirements of such subjects as Latin, Greek, and later English. The Eight-Year Study demonstrated the inappropriateness of such requirements. However, colleges and universities then began to place increasing reliance on high school grades and "scholastic aptitude" tests. Both of these, of course, are related to verbal (plus some mathematical) ability and correlate highly with one another and with success in college, as measured by grade point average.

Throughout the years, and particularly recently, the definition of academic ability has been broadened in practice to include much greater numbers. According to William W. Turnbull in Higher Education for Everybody?:

> "By 1960, 80 percent of students in the top quarter of their high school class were going on to college. The proportion for the succeeding quarters were 54 percent, 32 percent, and -- from the lowest quarter of the class -- 19 percent. By 1960, then, we had begun to approach the ceiling on the proportion of the academically talented students (as defined by high school performance) who go to college. The expansion in the proportion of students continuing beyond high school is now occurring mainly in the second, third, and fourth ability groups.

> "Higher education, then, is serving a new clientele along with the old . . .What we are discussing . . .is not the appearance on the higher educational scene of ability groups hitherto unrepresented; for many years students from the lowest quartile in secondary school have been going to college. Rather we are now seeing a relative increase in the number of such students in higher education as a whole and their appearance on particular campuses where until now, they have been represented only nominally, if at all."

Nevertheless, "academic ability" continues to dominate admissions considerations, particularly at highly selective institutions. Research has shown that many nonacademic accomplishments are independent of academic accomplishments, that nonacademic accomplishment can be assessed with moderate reliability, and that both academic and nonacademic accomplishment can be predicted with moderate success. These findings, as Leonard L. Baird and James M. Richards, Jr., have pointed out, imply a need to re-examine admission practices, since colleges and universities are (or should be) concerned with identifying students who will do outstanding things outside the classroom and in later life as well as students who will get satisfactory grades.

TOWARD "UNIVERSAL ACCESS"

Because of conditions such as those just described, this country has not yet achieved "universal higher education" in the sense that the term is commonly used. Half our high school graduates now begin college, but many of these drop out along the way. And large numbers of youths never graduate from high school. However, "universal access to higher education" (the goal recently recommended by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education) is much nearer at hand.

A survey of present admission practices of the more than 2500 colleges and universities in the United States would indicate that any high school grad-

uate (and many non-graduates), no matter what their high school grades, test scores, or other characteristics, can find within this country at least a handful of institutions of higher education that will admit them and, more importantly, where the nature of the student body is such that the person admitted has a fair chance of succeeding academically. Those who do not wish to attend a traditional college or university have available to them the wide range of other kinds of post-secondary education.

As Joseph J. Schwab has written:

> ". . .the hope of universal higher education will not be well served by a universal mix in which all institutions try to be all things to all students. Neither will it be well served by ad hoc models. . . .
>
> "The hope of universal higher education will be better served by an intelligent expansion and radical revision of the diversity of production model programs which have characterized American higher education since 1940."

APPENDIX A

The Structure of Higher Education as it Relates to Access

> "Four fundamental questions face higher education in the 1970's. These questions have always been with us, but they now appear to be demanding new answers. They are: (1) What is higher education? (2) Who should receive a higher education? (3) How should institutions of higher education function? and (4) How should higher education be financed?"
>
> -- Fred F. Harcleroad

Any meaningful discussion of access to higher education requires a recognition that the definition of what constitutes higher education gradually changes throughout the years. "Search for an authoritative definition of a college or university that is flexible enough to fit changing conditions over half a century or longer is fruitless," wrote Floyd C. Wilcox in 1932. "A history of the attempt to define a college or university represents an evolution in thinking and practice." At certain times in history, in fact, this process of change has accelerated dramatically. . . as when many new institutions were established in a short period of time or new forms of higher education were created."

MAJOR CHANGES IN STRUCTURE

American undergraduate education has witnessed at least four important periods of change in function and structure:

(1) Harvard College, founded in 1636, set the pattern for what here will be called the Old American College (the small private liberal arts college) that distinctive kind of institution which flourished and dominated American education on all levels

for about two centuries and a half.

(2) The Dartmouth College case decision in 1819 helped start an education boom which led to the founding of hundreds of new small private colleges, many of them church-related. As a result, the number of colleges in America increased explosively from 25 in 1800 to 412 by 1880.

(3) The Old American College ceased being supreme soon after the Civil War because of two events in particular -- the Land-Grant College Act in 1862 and the opening of Johns Hopkins University in 1876. These events led to the establishment of new educational functions (specialized education and research) and new higher educational structures (land-grant colleges and state and private universities) to carry out these functions.

(4) The most important recent structural change in American higher education has been the rise of the two-year college. The junior college movement can be traced all the way back to the ideas of Henry P. Tappan in 1852 and William Rainey Harper in 1896; but the first two-year institutions were created in California, Missouri, and Texas in 1921; and the American Association of Junior Colleges was organized in the same year. National acceptance of the two-year college, and particularly the concept of a community college, occurred in more recent years, however. This development reached a significant point in the fall of 1969, when for the first time more students enrolled as freshmen in two-year colleges than in four-year colleges.

OTHER INFLUENCES ON STRUCTURE

The nature and shape of higher education have been changed by other forces as well:

(1) A particularly rapid growth in enrollment or a significant change in the types of students enrolled have an obvious effect on higher education institutions. The tremendous enrollment boom resulting from the GI Bill of post-World War II, and to a lesser extend the post-Korean conflict, for example, brought into colleges and universities not only many additional students but also students with sharply different attitudes toward education.

(2) A significant number of institutions of higher education, while retaining their same basic structure and commitment, have changed or considerably broadened their role and their student clientele. As an example of this, the state colleges (AASCU's member institutions) have developed from teachers colleges and technical institutes into institutions that offer a broad range of studies up through the masters degree, and in some cases, the doctorate.

(3) Throughout the years there has been a steady growth in what has been called the "invisible apparatus" of higher (or, if you will, post-secondary) education. And society increasingly is taking note of the existence, and accepting the legitimacy, of this enterprise. Approximately 7,000 proprietary institutions (business schools, technical institutes, etc.) serve about 1-1/2 million students. Correspondence schools enroll an estimated five million students. Also, business and industry, labor

unions, national voluntary organizations, and various levels of government (particularly the federal government and, within that, especially the military) operate extensive educational programs.

(4) Publicly supported institutions in many instances have developed branch campuses and/or satellite colleges and in virtually all states public colleges and universities have been brought together under a single board or some sort of coordinating mechanism. (For example, the State University of New York with 65 campuses and 316,000 students, the California State College system with 19 campuses and 288,000 students, and the State University of Florida with 7 campuses and 80,000 students.) These developments have had, and will continue to have, an effect upon the way institutions function.

The most important, pervasive change in the structure of American higher education, however, has been the growth in the number of institutions, and at a rapidly accelerating rate. The number of colleges increased from one in 1636 to nine in 1776 to 25 in 1800. But by 1880, 412 institutions of higher education were in operation, and from then on, the growth has been spectacular:

Year	Number of Accredited Institutions*
1900	977
1910	951
1920	1041
1930	1409
1940	1708

*from 1970 Digest of Educational Statistics, Office of Education.

Year	Number of Accredited Institutions
1950	1851
1960	2008
1970	2525

RECENT TREND TOWARD UNIFORMITY

All of the above developments notwithstanding, it must be noted that, except for the manifestation of the junior college, no completely new kinds of institutional structures have appeared upon the higher educational scene since the last decade of the nineteenth century. In 1892, the last great university - the University of Chicago - opened and in 1895, the last state university - the University of Montana - completed the roster. These events marked the closing years of the great period of expansion and diversification that occurred in American higher education between 1885 and 1921.

A CHANGE IN DIRECTION?

Recent concern has been expressed that America is now experiencing a "homogenization" of higher education. The Newman Task Force in its recent "Report on Higher Education," described the problem:

> "American higher education is renowned for its diversity. Yet, in fact, our colleges and universities have become extraordinarily similar. Nearly all 2500 institutions have adopted the same mode of teaching and learning. Nearly all strive to perform the same generalized educational mission. The traditional sources of differentiation -- between public and private, large and small, secular and sectarian, male and female -- are disappearing. Even the differences in character of individual institutions are fading. It is no longer true that most students have real choices among differing institutions in which to seek a higher education."

There has indeed been a strong tendency among institutions of higher education to ape one another or, more accurately to aspire to a "higher status." (Many two-year colleges would like to become four-year colleges, many colleges wish to achieve university status, and virtually all universities want to "out Harvard" Harvard.) The extent to which this has resulted in "homogenization," however, can be exaggerated. California Institute of Technology, California State Polytechnic College-Pomona, and California Baptist Seminary stand within a few miles of one another geographically but find themselves miles apart in terms of mission, curriculum, and student clientele. Even the nearby Claremont Colleges (Pomona, Scripps, Claremont Men's, Harvey Mudd, Pitzer) possess certain distinctive traits.

As John W. Gardner has written:

> "We do not want all institutions to be alike. We want institutions to develop their individualities and to keep those individualities. None must be ashamed of its distinctive features so long as it is doing something that contributes importantly to the total pattern, and so long as it is striving for excellence in performance. The highly selective, small liberal arts college should not be afraid to remain small. The large urban institution should not be ashamed that it is large. The technical institute should not be apologetic about being a technical institute. Each institution should pride itself on the role that it has chosen to play and on the special contribution which it brings to the total pattern of American higher education."

CURRENT EXPERIMENTS WITH "NEW FORMS"

Higher education in the 1970's continues to experiment with changes in shape and form. The question, "What is higher education?" is being answered in still different ways, including the development of new types of institutions (such as urban centers, free universities and new possibly credentialling universities) and through experimentation

within existing institutions (for example, cluster colleges, the college within a college, consortia arrangements, and universities without walls).

Some students of higher education, for example, Martin Trow, believe that the current crisis in higher education will lead within the next decade to more radical changes in the character of higher education in this country -- especially in the big universities that dominate it. Trow speculates that "if in fact we do not continue to move towards universal formal postsecondary education directly after high school, and moreover if the multiuniversity begins to break up into smaller, highly autonomous units with quite diverse functions, then the whole nature of admissions may change drastically."

A great amount of space has been devoted to looking at the changing structure/function of higher education for three reasons: (1) How one defines higher education obviously affects a study of access to higher education; (2) changes in structural function clearly have had an important influence on access; and (3) so much of what has been written about access ignores or underplays the crucial nature of this relationship.

APPENDIX B

(from: "Who Can and Should Go to What Kind of College?," PhD Dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, California, 1953.)

CHAPTER TWO

THE CHANGING STUDENT PERSONNEL OF AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

"The college student is not a class, he is a race, and he is a race which is the same, apparently, in all centuries as in all climes."[1] This hyperbole of Charles F. Thwing's, the most prolific of American higher educational historians, might be challenged because of the terms "class" and "race"; but nonetheless it embodies a sound historical generalization. College students have been a distinctive group since the days of the Ephebic College of Athens in the third century before Christ. In every country and era they have been marked off from other youths and from society at large by their customs and systems of values and especially by their self-consciousness. The yellowbeak or freshman of the medieval university had much in common with the ephebus of Athens, and in countless ways the green-capped freshman of the American college resembles both these predecessors. As with freshmen, so also with seniors, student societies, initiation practices, and with many other characteristics of students and student life "in all centuries" and "in all climes."

The students of the Old American College not only conformed generally to a common type, but they also differed substantially from the wide range of types among their present-day successors. The diversity that has replaced the uniformity of the first two and a half centuries of American higher education will be described in the sections that form the body of the chapter.

1. Age

Two facts must be emphasized in discussing the age of students during the three periods under review: median age and age range. The data to be presented in this section will show that the median age increased markedly

early in the period of expansion and diversification, descended later in that period, but continued to be much higher than in the period of the Old American College. Age range, on the other hand, has been broad in all three periods, but the broadest range occurred during the era of the Old American College which enrolled both very young students and some in their thirties.

The Period of the Old American College: To begin with, many of the students of the Old American College were much younger than is usually common in institutions of higher education today. About 1700, President Increase Mather contemptuously referred to Harvard undergraduates as "forty or fifty children, few of them capable of edification..."[1] In turn, one of his successors, President Samuel Willard, habitually addressed every student who came to him with the same words: "Well, child, what do you want?"[2] Many references in college laws, catalogues, presidents' reports, and biographies indicate the extreme youth of some of the students. Where legal requirements were established, the usual minimum age was 14. There are indications, however, that even this low age limit did not always hold. Some of the "children" of the Old American College, and their ages at graduation, are shown in Table Nine.

On the other hand, some of the students in the Old American College were much older than most present-day undergraduates, World War II veterans excluded. Examples of these mature students, and their ages at graduation, are listed in Table Ten.

As far as can be determined, the youngest student in any of the colleges during this period was just under eleven, the oldest about 32.

1. Pier, 1913: 116
2. Sprague, 1857-69: 130

49

TABLE NINE

YOUNGER GRADUATES OF THE OLD AMERICAN COLLEGE

Name	College	Class	Age at Graduation
George Bancroft	Harvard	1821	18
Phillips Brooks	Harvard	1855	19
Charles Chauncey	Yale	1792	15
Paul Dudley	Harvard	1690	14
Timothy Dwight	Yale	1769	17
Jonathan Edwards	Yale	1720	16
Ralph Waldo Emerson	Harvard	1821	18
David Humphreys	Yale	1771	17
Sidney Lanier	Oglethorp	1860	19
Henry Wadsworth Longfellow	Bowdoin	1825	18
Charles Russell Lowell	Harvard	1854	19
James Russell Lowell	Harvard	1838	19
Cotton Mather	Harvard	1678	15
Samuel F. B. Morse	Yale	1810	19
John Lathrop Motley	Harvard	1831	17
Andrew Preston Peabody	Harvard	1826	15
Benjamin Rush	Princeton	1760	15
Benjamin Silliman	Yale	1796	17
George Ticknor	Dartmouth	1807	16
John Trumbull	Yale	1767	17
Francis Wayland	Union	1813	17
Daniel Webster	Dartmouth	1801	19

TABLE TEN

OLDER GRADUATES OF THE OLD AMERICAN COLLEGE

Name	College	Class	Age at Graduation
Joseph Backus	Yale	1718	27
T. C. Brownell	Union	1804	25
Horace Bushnell	Yale	1827	25
Henry Butler	Harvard	1651	27
Charles Chauncey	Yale	1779	32
Manasseh Cutler	Yale	1765	23
Henry Durant	Yale	1827	25
William Eaton	Dartmouth	1790	26
G. Stanley Hall	Williams	1867	23
Levi Hodge	Harvard	1792	26
Thomas Hill	Harvard	1843	25
David Hubbard	Yale	1721	27
Horace Mann	Brown	1819	23
John Marshall	William and Mary	1788*	25
Simon Newcomb	Lawrence S. S.	1858	23
Samuel Phillips	Harvard	1650	25
Benjamin Pomeroy	Yale	1733	29
Nathaniel Roberts	Yale	1732	28
J. H. Seelye	Amherst	1849	25
Jared Sparks	Harvard	1815	26
Colonel Asa Ware	Yale	1863	24
Eli Whitney	Yale	1792	27

* Year of attendance; did not graduate.

The most extensive studies of student age have been made at Harvard where during the seventeenth century the youngest entering freshman was 10 years and ten months old, the oldest 23 years and one month old, and the average a little above 15 years and seven months.[1] During the eighteenth century the median age of entrance stood below 17 in all but two of the pre-revolutionary classes, but it rose during the war and remained above 17 until 1789. It then fluctuated between 16½ and 17½ until 1800 and fell to 15½ around the turn of the century. During the nineteenth century the median age of freshmen began to rise slowly until, in 1845, it passed 17 years.[2]

The Period of Expansion and Diversification: The age of students increased for many reasons including the development of new kinds of secondary schools, the expansion of knowledge to be mastered before admission to college, and the adoption by colleges of minimum age requirements. The Harvard Board of Overseers ruled in 1864, for example, that no students would be admitted until they had reached their sixteenth birthdays, and the University of Virginia opened in 1825 with the same regulation.[3] Other colleges set up similar age standards.

During the early decades of the 1880-1921 period the median age of entering freshmen continued to mount, reaching a high of 19 at Harvard in 1883.[4] This development caused considerable concern especially among those responsible for professional education because they were concurrently attempting to extend the years of work in the professional schools of law and medicine in particular and were also attempting to require a bachelor's degree for admission. With the typical student graduating from college at almost 24 years of age and with professional education requiring three or

1. Morison, 1936: 105.1
2. Morison, 1937: 106.1
3. Bruce, 1920-22: 17
4. Morison, 1937: 106.2

four more years, professional school people became alarmed and insisted that something be done to reduce the age of college graduation. The demand led President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard to attempt to shorten the length of the Harvard undergraduate course to three years. He did not succeed. He failed in part because the standardization of secondary education forced the median age of freshmen back to about 18 years. By 1915 the approximate age of admission to all colleges was 18 years and five months.[1]

The Present Scene: The average continued to go down. A 1937 study, for example, showed that 38.3 per cent of students entered college below 18, 35.4 per cent at 18, and 26.3 per cent above 18.[2] No recent research on a national scale has been published concerning the age changes among college students caused by the loss of enrollment during the war and the influx of veterans after the war. It probably can be assumed that students averaged somewhat younger during the war and slightly older in the post-war period.

2. Sex

Today Americans take for granted the higher education of women, but this has been a development of the past three-quarters of a century. When M. Carey Thomas entered Cornell a decade after the end of the Civil War, she had seen only one college woman--and this despite the fact that she lived in a large city and in a cultivated home. She later wrote that she had feared that the lone representative of female learning had "hoofs and horns."[3] The change from then to now will here be reviewed.

The Period of the Old American College: The Old American College served a strictly masculine clientele, a tradition that still exerts a strong

1. Sharpless, 1915: 125
2. McNelly, 1937: 97
3. Life Magazine, 1947: 93

influence especially on Northeastern colleges and universities. As Edwin E. Slosson wrote in 1910:

> For more than two hundred years after the first colleges were established in America their doors were barred against women. Even the rudiments of education were grudgingly granted in colonial days; and if any women were bold enough to claim the privilege of learning the things that men were encouraged to know, it was at the peril of social disapprobation.[1]

It seems, however, that at least one woman faced such a peril in a vain effort to gain entrance to Harvard. In 1849 H. W. Longfellow wrote in his journal: "We have had at Faculty meeting an application from a young lady to enter College as a regular student."[2] No further information seems to be available giving the girl's name or what answer she received from the all-male faculty of the all-male college. During the colonial period men almost monopolized elementary education, too. In the first half of the eighteenth century fewer than 40 per cent of the women of New England who signed legal papers wrote their names; the others made their marks. Women's education in the best families usually went no farther than writing and arithmetic, and it was considered fashionable to ridicule female learning.[3] The only schools for women were dame schools, adventure schools, and seminaries, the latter two types beginning near the close of the eighteenth century and offering training in "polite accomplishments."[4] Girls were not admitted to the public schools of Boston until 1769.[5] The Latin grammar schools were the only schools preparing for college, and Thomas Woody writes that "there is nothing to indicate that girls ever attended the Latin school."[6] Only one other opportunity presented itself to the women of the colonial period--self-education. According to Slosson:

1. Slosson, 1921: 127.1
2. Longfellow, 1886: 94
3. Talbot, 1910: 135
4. Woody, 1929: 156.1
5. Talbot, 1910: 135
6. Woody, 1929: 156.2

> Here and there a bright ambitious girl might borrow her brother's books and rival him in his preparatory studies, but when he went off to college she could not follow him.[1]

A few intelligent and industrious women followed this solitary method of higher education. Before the end of the eighteenth century, for example, Lucinda Foot qualified for entrance to Yale, but the faculty refused to admit her. Eliza Pinckney of South Carolina, Abigail Adams and Mercy Otis Warren of Massachusetts, Anna Maulin Zenger of New York, the mother of George Wythe of Virginia, and many others became well-educated women through self-study.[2]

The humanitarian movement placed female education high on its list of objectives, and schools and colleges for girls and young women began to be organized. In the South many seminaries, institutes, and so-called colleges were started in the first half of the nineteenth century including among the first Elizabeth Academy (1818), Georgia Female College (1836), and Judson Female Institute (1839). The first to open in the North included Emma Willard Seminary (1821), Hartford Female Seminary (1822), and Mount Holyoke Seminary (1839).[3] Many years were to pass, however, before these and other institutions for the education of women were to be considered comparable to the men's colleges. Meanwhile the wits ridiculed the effort. In 1834 The New York Transcript and The Boston Transcript made great fun of the fact that the "Young Ladies College" in Kentucky was granting degrees:

> ...the gentlemen of the press suggested the degrees suitable for a female college: Mistress of Pudding Making, Mistress of the Scrubbing Brush, Mistress of Common Sense. Best of all would be the honorary degrees: R. W., Respectable Wife, and M. W. R. F., Mother of a Well Regulated Family.[4]

1. Slosson, 1921: 127.2
2. Beard, 1944: 6.3
3. Slosson, 1921: 127.2
4. Boas, 1935: 10

Elmira College offered the equivalent of collegiate work beginning in 1855, but the first women's college to be recognized as a real institution of higher education was Vassar College (1861).[1] As President M. Carey Thomas of Bryn Mawr later pointed out, "in Vassar we have the legitimate parent of all future colleges for women which were to be founded in such rapid succession in the next period."[2]

Other institutions which became colleges close to the end of the period of the Old American College were Wells (1870), Wellesley (1870), Smith (1871), and Mount Holyoke (1893).[3] Many other institutions claim early status as colleges for women, but it is difficult to determine just when most of them ceased being seminaries or normal schools and began offering instruction considered to be of collegiate level.[4]

The nineteenth century also saw the beginnings of coeducation, starting with such early and unsuccessful efforts as those of Blount College (the antecedent of the University of Tennessee) and Mississippi College.[5] The first successful adoption of coeducation occurred in 1833 at Oberlin College which conferred the first degrees upon women in American history in 1841.* Antioch College followed in 1853; Michigan, California, Illinois, and Missouri in 1870; Cornell in 1872; Boston in 1873; and Wisconsin in 1874.[6] A few state universities like Utah (1850), Iowa (1856), Kansas (1866), Minnesota (1868), and Nebraska (1876) opened with coeducation.[7]

1. Thompson, 1947: 137
2. Slosson, 1921: 127.3
3. Adams, 1911: 2.1
4. Woody, 1929: 156.3
5. Wills, 1936: 154.2
6. Adams, 1911: 2.2
7. Adams, 1911: 2.1

*Oberlin admitted women students from its opening in 1833, but none entered upon collegiate instruction until 1837.

The women's colleges and the coeducational state universities founded during the closing years of this period were but pioneers of the new kinds of institutions of higher education that were to multiply in the next period.

The Period of Expansion and Diversification: Despite the fact that higher education slowly became available to women through colleges of their own and through coeducation, opportunities for preparation for college continued to be meager. The opening of the Girls Latin School in Boston in 1878 gave women their first opportunity to be fitted for college in the public schools. In Philadelphia no girls could be prepared for college in the public schools before 1893.[1]

Throughout this period, but especially in the last part of the nineteenth century, higher educational facilities for women increased substantially. More colleges for women were established including Bryn Mawr College (1880), Mills College (1885), and Goucher College (1888).[2] After 1890, however, few new institutions for the higher education of women were founded. The several exceptions were Rockford College (1892), Randolph-Macon Women's College (1893), Simmons College (1902), William Smith College for Women (1908), Connecticut College for Women (1911), and Wheaton College (1912)? In 1893, 12,300 girls attended women's colleges. By 1903 the figure had risen to 16,744 and by 1913 to 19,142. Meanwhile, more colleges and universities adopted coeducation. In 1893 coeducational institutions registered 13,058 women. This number had grown to 26,990 by 1903 and to 55,564 by 1913.[4]

Early in this period a third type of higher education for women developed, namely the coordinate college. These institutions allowed long-established colleges and universities for men to provide for the education

1. Talbot, 1910: 135
2. Adams, 1911: 2.2
3. Adams, 1911: 2.1
4. Glosson, 1921: 127.4

of women in separate but affiliated institutions, thereby avoiding an outright break with tradition. Radcliffe College (1894) originated as the "Harvard Annex" in 1879.[1] Other coordinate colleges were the College for Women of Western Reserve (1888), Barnard College of Columbia (1889), H. Sophie Newcomb Memorial College of Tulane (1896), and the Pembroke College of Brown (1897).[2]

As a result of the development of these three kinds of higher education for women during the period of expansion and diversification, enrollment figures climbed sharply. In 1870 women accounted for about 20 per cent of the college graduates of that year; by 1940 more than 40 per cent of college graduates were women.[3] By far the greatest part of this development occurred in coeducational institutions. For the growth in college and university enrollment figures for women as compared with men see Table Eight.

The Present Scene: The number of women entering higher educational institutions has continued to climb throughout this present period despite the drop in male and in total enrollment. About 70 per cent of 1947-48 college students, however, were men as the result of the priority given to veterans and the "quota systems" used in some institutions. But in spite of this fact, the number of women attending college that year broke all previous records, totaling 678,977.[4] A 1949 study by Elmo Roper found that girls seek to go to college somewhat less often than do boys in spite of higher ratings on scholastic aptitude tests. A surprisingly large number of women want to go to college, however, and "current pressures are such as to favor the girl applicant." She has a better chance than a boy of equal class standing both to get into college at all and have any college application accepted.[5] An American

1. Morison, 1937: 106.3
2. Adams, 1911: 2.1
3. Harris, 1949: 58
4. Schaffter, 1950: 123
5. Roper, 1949: 122

Council on Education Study of 1949 also discovered that boys have somewhat more difficulty than girls in getting into college.[1] As a result of the present "peace-time" draft, women probably will continue to be sought after by colleges and universities to fill in enrollment gaps. Even traditional men's colleges such as St. John's are turning to coeducation to keep their classrooms filled.

3. Race

American higher education began with a commitment to interracial education, Harvard early in its history devoting considerable energy to its "Indian College" erected in the Harvard Yard about 1655.[2] This and other experiments in intermingling white and Indian youths failed, and the big drive for Negro higher education did not get under way until after the Emancipation Proclamation. Today the much-discussed racial question in higher education relates almost entirely to higher education for Negroes although many other minority racial groups feel the impact of discrimination. The history of both Indian and Negro higher education in the United States will here be sketched.

The Period of the Old American College: The Old American College was, of course, predominantly a "white" institution. The only non-whites of any large numbers during this period were Indians and Negroes, and the relatively few efforts of the Old American College to educate members of these two races proved spectacularly unsuccessful.

During the colonial period the Old American College made some sincere attempts to provide higher education for Indians. Almost all of these

1. American Council on Education, 1949: 5.3
2. Morison, 1937: 106.4

efforts failed, however, because, as James Russell Lowell put it: "The Indians showed a far greater natural predisposition for disfurnishing the outside of other people's heads than for furnishing the insides of their own."[1] A persistent delusion of the English colonists, as Morison has pointed out, was that the proper way to civilize an Indian was to catch him and send him to college.[2]

The Virginia colony made the first attempt to provide higher education for Indians. In 1619 the London Company granted land for colleges for the English and the Indians, and George Thrope was chosen to head the enterprise. But, in Slosson's words, "...the Indians soon put an end to this ambitious enterprise by scalping him and sixteen of his tenants."[3] Undismayed, the colonists later founded William and Mary and there continued their efforts to educate Indians.

Harvard was the first college to have any success in the venture. The first student believed to be Indian was John Sassamon, who attended Harvard some time before 1651. He left without graduating, eventually became an aide to King Philip, and was later murdered for betraying his chief. Only four other Indian students are known to have attended Harvard during the seventeenth century, the only graduate being Caleb Chixcarui, Chessechamuck, Chesschaumuk, Cheshchaamog, or Cheeshahteaumuck as he has been variously named.[4]

Eleazar Wheelock, the founder and first president of Dartmouth, had a great deal of success in training Indian youths in elementary work during his pre-Dartmouth days. Samson Occom, a Mohegan Indian of the New York colony, studied with him in Connecticut for three years. He later became

1. Lowell, 1887: 95.1
2. Morison, 1937: 106.4
3. Slosson, 1921: 127.5
4. Morison, 1936: 105.2

a famous preacher and during a three-year visit to England helped raise 12,000 pounds for Wheelock's work in Indian education. Some of it helped finance Dartmouth College which Wheelock organized in 1769.[1] Wheelock met with difficulties, however, in Indian higher education. For example, one of his students, Woolley, was returned from Princeton in disgrace for "drunkeness and various incivilities."[2] Wheelock later saw three of his students receive their degrees from Dartmouth in the eighteenth century. Another Indian graduated in 1835.[3]

Altogether, in the English colonies Indians attended Dartmouth, Harvard, Princeton, and William and Mary.[4] The higher education of Indians during the colonial period constituted one of the accepted functions of the Old American College, but all attempts turned out badly. After the Revolution the higher education of Indians in white institutions waned markedly.

Few Negroes attended established elementary or secondary schools during the period of the Old American College. Most Southern states and many Northern states legally forbad the education of Negroes. Elias Neau, a French Protestant of New York, in 1704 probably opened the first school regularly established for Negroes (and also for Indians) in the North.[5] In the South the Reverend Samual Thomas organized a school in South Carolina in 1705.[6] Other schools opened and closed sporadically. The first Negro known to have entered college was John Chavis, a North Carolina free Negro who was sent to Princeton in 1797 by two Granville County gentlemen "to see if a Negro could take a college education." He did not graduate. No Negro graduated from an established college before 1826 when John Baptist Russworm

1. Malone, 1936: 99
2. Thwing, 1906: 139.2
3. Richardson, 1932: 121.1
4. Adams, 1946: 1
5. Washington, 1911: 147.1
6. Bond, 1934: 11.1

received his degree from Bowdoin.[1] Negroes occasionally were admitted to other colleges in the North during this period, but such occasions were rare. By 1852 Negro students had attended Bowdoin College, Rutland College, Athens College, Jefferson College, Franklin College, and Hanover College among others.[2] Perhaps the outstanding early success occurred at Oberlin College which began admitting Negroes when it admitted women in 1832.[3] Negroes received little in the way of opportunities for higher education, however, until groups began establishing separate colleges for them both in the North and in the South.

Active during this period were two groups--the colonization advocates before the Civil War and the Freedman's Bureau immediately after. Backers of the colonization movement planned to train exceptionally bright Negro youths as teachers, preachers, and physicians so that they might return to their native colonies in Africa and serve their people. Several schools opened beginning as early as 1817. None of them could be considered of collegiate grade, and all eventually failed because of opposition from free Negroes and abolitionists.[4] The Freedman's Bureau operated during the Reconstruction period and was active in developing institutions to train a "native" teaching force for Southern Negro children. "The list of colleges and 'universities' established by the Bureau in cooperation with religious societies," wrote Horace Mann Bond, "includes almost every well-known Negro institution of this caliber in the present day."[5] Among the many Southern institutions founded in the post-Civil War period were Lincoln Institute (1865), Shaw University (1865), Hampton Institute (1866), Fisk University

1. Bond, 1934: 11.2
2. Woodson, 1915: 155.1
3. Boas, 1935: 10
4. Woodson, 1915: 155.2
5. Bond, 1934: 11.3

(1866), Tougaloo University (1869), Talladega College (1869), and Claftin University (1869).[1]

Before the Civil War many of the Northern states had separate schools for Negroes. Most colleges refused to accept Negroes, the notable exceptions being Oneida Institute, New York Central College, and Oberlin College. Two of the Negro colleges founded in this period still flourish--Ashmun Institute, now Lincoln University (1854), and Wilberforce University (1856).[2] During the middle of the nineteenth century colleges for Negroes were established in Indiana, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, and Vermont.[3]

The Period of Expansion and Diversification: Indian history after the Revolution falls into four periods: 1789-1871, the "treaty period"; 1871-1887, the "reservation period"; 1887-1934, the "allotment period"; and 1934 to the present, the "reorganization period."[4] Prior to the passage of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 federal provisions for the higher education of Indians had been negligible.[5] But from 1934 on the Indian Service began to take an interest in the problem. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1935 stated that:

> ...Indian education must reckon with the fact... that there will be Indian children of more than ordinary ability and talents who must be given an opportunity to develop this ability and these talents to the highest possible point...[6]

The Indian Service did not maintain any colleges and universities "since it has been found that Indian youth can successfully utilize the same institutions of higher education as do other groups." Provision therefore was made for several types of assistance to students desiring higher education. These

1. Washington, 1911: 147.2
2. Myrdel, 1944: 108.1
3. Woodson, 1915: 155.3
4. Blauch, 1939: 9.1
5. Adams, 1946: 1
6. U.S. Dept. of Interior, 1935: 141

included scholarships, loans, and combinations of these.[1] In addition, many colleges and universities began to offer scholarships and other types of aid to Indian students.[2] As a small minority group, however, Indians by 1940 presented only a small part of the total race problem in the United States. An estimate of the size of the various racial groups in the United States for that year showed the following figures: Negroes, 12,865,518; Mexicans, 3,500,000; Indians, 361,816; Japanese, 126,947; Chinese, 77,504; Filipinos, 45,563; Hindus, 2,405; and Koreans, 1,711.[3]

All of these racial groups have experienced discrimination in higher education at some time and in some section or sections of the country. The problem of the Negro has continued to be the largest and the most insistent both in terms of the number of persons involved and in the nationwide character of the discrimination practiced. The problem of Indian higher education does not attract much public attention and has not since the end of the eighteenth century.

During the period between the Civil War and World War II the higher education of Negroes, like higher education generally, developed phenomenally. This was true both in the North and in the South although the education efforts in these two areas developed differently.

At the beginning of this period almost five million Negroes lived in the United States, most of them still in the South.[4] They had been newly freed, and during the Reconstruction period many religious and philanthropic groups worked to establish educational institutions for them in the South. These efforts, however, were short-lived:

> ...the North soon wearied of the enthusiasm of peace as it had tired ten years before of the prolonged fever of war.

1. Blauch, 1939: 9.2
2. Adams, 1946: 1
3. McWilliams, 1943: 98
4. U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1949: 140

> Philanthropic subsidies dwindled soon after the abolition of the Freedman's Bureau in 1879 left the new colleges suspended over a mass of ignorance.[1]

Only 16 per cent of the Negroes were literate.[2] State school systems developed slowly, and not until 1910 did Southern states begin to assume responsibility for the secondary education of Negroes. Public higher education for them came still later. As a result, the task of providing higher education fell to the new private Negro colleges which had few students and fewer funds. At times standards dropped extremely low, and the colleges were ridiculed by critics. By the end of this period (1941), however, 113 institutions of higher education for Negroes had been established in the South--83 colleges and universities and 30 junior colleges. Thirty-nine were publicly supported; 32 were financed by private boards; and 42 were under church control. By 1940 every Southern state had at least one public college for the education of Negroes.[3]

In the North it is impossible to chart the development of higher education for Negroes because no records of student race are kept by most colleges and universities. The North, of course, did not follow the Southern pattern of separate institutions. In the 30 non-Southern states two colleges for Negroes were established before the Civil War, and two opened after that conflict. Otherwise, Negroes in the North have attended "white" institutions. No public institution of higher education in the North has prohibited the enrollment of Negroes. Among private colleges and universities discrimination has occurred at some institutions but not at others. Harvard, Chicago, and Columbia, for example, restrict Negroes to no significant extent. Princeton, on the other hand, admitted no Negro students during this period.[4]

1. Bond, 1934: 11.4
2. Myrdal, 1944: 103.2
3. Embree, 1943: 49
4. Myrdal, 1944: 103.3

By the close of the period the number of Negroes in the United States had increased to more than 12 million. Many of them have moved to the North, but the majority still live in the South. In the country as a whole in 1940 only 1.3 per cent of the adult Negroes were college graduates as compared to 5.4 per cent of native whites. Discrimination has not been confined to any one area. The proportion of those over 25 years of age who had at least one year of college was the same in the South as in the North (not including the Pacific or Mountain states)--9.2 to 9.5 per cent.[1] Barriers to higher education had taken the forms of separate but unequal institutions in the South, economic discrimination in the North.

The Present Scene: Few Negroes in comparison with whites attend college. The 1940 ratio of 1.3 per cent Negroes in college as compared to 5.4 per cent native whites has not been considerably changed during the present period. In addition, only a small proportion of the Negroes who do attend college are in Northern institutions. In 1947 the colleges and universities enrolled 75,000 Negroes, 85 per cent of them attending 105 segregated institutions in the South.[2] Gains are being made against segregation in the South on the legal front. A series of decisions by the Supreme Court, beginning with the Murray and Gaines cases, have now forced most Southern States to drop their traditional "separate but equal" doctrine at least for graduate and professional studies. The Southern Conference Education Fund has reported that in 1950 approximately 200 Negroes were enrolled in 21 Southern colleges and universities that had formerly been all white. Benjamin Fine of The New York Times reported in the same year that 1,000 or more Negroes were attending classes with white students in the 17 Southern states.[3]

1. Myrdal, 1944: 108.4
2. Ivy and Ross, 1949: 82.1
3. Konvitz, 1951: 88

It may be quite a while before these pioneer efforts will be felt in undergraduate education, however, although the state of Kentucky has made the first move and now allows mixed classes at Berea College and the University of Louisville. Discrimination against Negroes in the North still exists, of course, and it operates in three important ways--poverty, poor educational preparation, and deliberate exclusion. Although many institutions will not admit that they bar Negroes, they include questions about race on their application forms or ask for photographs of applicants.[1]

Negroes clearly do not have equal educational opportunities with whites, but large strides have been made toward equality during recent years. These will be described in Chapter Three.

4. Religion

Religious discrimination has been a fact in American higher education since its earliest days. Probably less prejudice exists now than during the recent past, but studies published during the past few years show continuing discrimination against Jewish and Roman Catholic applicants for college admission--especially against the former. The history of the problem to be reviewed forthwith shows in particular that the comity existing among the Protestant sects often does not apply to Jews and Roman Catholics seeking college admission.

The Period of the Old American College: All the colonial colleges except Pennsylvania were founded under the auspices of various Protestant sects: Harvard, Yale, and Dartmouth by the Congregationalists; Princeton by the Presbyterians; Rutgers by the Dutch Reformed; William and Mary and Columbia

1. Ivy and Ross, 1949: 82.2

by the Episcopalians; and Brown by the Baptists. A heavy majority of later institutions also began under religious control.[1] It is not strange, therefore, to discover that those in control of the Old American College emphasized religion. An illustration of this importance occurred when President Henry Dunster of Harvard, after many years of faithful service to the college, decided not to have his fourth child baptized. As a result, he was forced to resign the presidency. According to Morison:

> The news that President Dunster had become an 'anti-paedobaptist' created much the same sensation in New England as would be aroused in the country today if President Conant should announce his adherence to communism.[2]

Yet "neither in the act of 1642, nor in the Charter of 1650, nor in the laws and statutes passed by Overseers and Fellows was any religious test or oath imposed" at Harvard.[3] Yale, founded partly as a reaction to Harvard's religious liberalism, was more careful in selecting its students. In 1754 Samuel Johnson protested, to no avail, that the president of Yale did not have the right to exclude from the benefit of education in the college certain people holding certain religious beliefs.[4] None of the other colonial colleges imposed religious tests.[5] Brown, Columbia, Pennsylvania and Princeton had specific provisions forbidding them.

All of this, however, occurred on paper. Actually, before the Revolution nine of the 13 colonies established a "standing order" in religion. In five of the colonies--Virginia, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire--colleges were founded by the state and church acting largely as one, and the "established church" of each colony maintained a privileged position. In other areas--North Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee,

1. Tewksbury, 1932: 136.2
2. Morison, 1936: 105.3
3. Morison, 1936: 105.4
4. Thwing, 1906: 139.3
5. Walsh, 1935: 145.1

Ohio, and Indiana--Presbyterian interests held a virtual monopoly despite the early separation of church and state. In Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Rhode Island there existed a degree of religious freedom; but religious sects other than those already well established found it difficult to open institutions of their own. Not until the principle of the complete separation of church and state was accepted by the states and written into the Constitution of the United States were the exclusive privileges of the Anglican colleges in Virginia and New York and of the Congregational colleges in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire challenged.[1]

During most of the period of the Old American College certain religious groups were fairly active in higher education especially the Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Lutherans, German Reformed, Dutch Reformed, Unitarians, and, to a certain extent, Roman Catholics. Other denominations, including the Methodists, Disciples, Friends, United Brethren, Christians, Universalists, and Baptists (except for Brown), were not particularly interested in sponsoring institutions of higher education. Youths of the latter denominations had no colleges of their own to attend and in most cases found it difficult, impossible, or undesirable to enter colleges sponsored by other sects. Before the close of this period, however, almost all of the Protestant sects had established colleges.[2]

The Roman Catholic population of America was small during the colonial period. When Father Jogues, a French Jesuit of Canada, visited Manhattan Island in 1644 he found but two Roman Catholics--an Irishman and a Portuguese woman. The few American Roman Catholics tended to concentrate in Maryland. Roman Catholic schools were started in Maryland in 1644 and in New York in 1684, but both were later suppressed. A 1704 Maryland law

1. Tewksbury, 1932: 136.3 2. Tewksbury, 1932: 136.4

provided heavy fines for Roman Catholics who attempted to keep school or to educate youth in any way. Despite this handicap, wealthy communicants resorted either to hiring Jesuit tutors or to sending their sons abroad to the Belgian College of St. Omer. Another Roman Catholic school operated at Bohemia Manor, Maryland between 1706 and 1765. It developed into a classical college and numbered among its pupils John Carroll, later Archbishop of Baltimore, and Charles Carroll, known as "the best penman among the signers of the Declaration of Independence." In 1789, 15,800 Marylanders were Roman Catholics, 7,000 Pennsylvanians, and the remaining few thousand spread among the other states. In that year the Society of Jesus founded the first real Catholic college--Georgetown.[1]

Between 1789 and 1850, 38 Roman Catholic colleges for men were established in the United States. Eight of these did not survive to the end of the period. Only 11 have survived as colleges or universities to the present time--Georgetown, Mt. St. Mary's, Holy Cross, Fordham, St. Francis, Villanova, St. Vincent's, Notre Dame, St. Louis, Xavier, and Spring Hill. After 1850 came a great increase in the number of Catholic colleges for men. Between that year and 1866, 55 new institutions opened. Twenty-five of these had very short histories, but 30 of them survived until 1866. Only 18 continue in operation today, making a total of 29 permanent Roman Catholic colleges and universities founded before the Civil War.[2] At the end of this period 14 religious orders operated 60 Roman Catholic colleges and universities. Only three of these, however, were primarily lay institutions.[3]

A few Jews migrated to America during the early part of the colonial period, most of them settling in New England, New York, Maryland, and Virginia. They "were not allowed at this time to live as avowed Jews in any

1. Slosson, 1921: 127.6
2. Erbacher, 1931: 51
3. Burns, 1937: 18.1

of the principal countries that then had colonies in America except Holland.[1] The number of Jews grew slowly until at the time of the Revolution about 700 families had settled in the colonies.[2] The higher education of Jews, therefore, did not present much of a problem during colonial times. The few students who aspired to college training had to contend with the religious motives of the Old American College. The charter of Brown, one of the most liberal of the colonial colleges, allowed students of all religious beliefs but forbade any student to assert his disbelief in Christianity except "Young Gentlemen of the Hebrew Nation."[3]

The first known Jewish student matriculated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1772.[4] Judah Monis, an Italian Jew converted to Christianity, took his master's degree at Harvard in 1720 and subsequently taught Hebrew there.[5]

The Jewish population grew steadily from 1776 to 1880. Although no accurate figures are available, accepted estimates place the number at 3,000 in 1818, 6,000 in 1826, 15,000 in 1840, 50,000 in 1848, and about 150,000 at the beginning of the Civil War.[6] By 1881 the number of Jews in the United States had increased to 250,000. The violent repressions of Jews in Russia in the 1880's and thereafter brought them to American shores in great waves which subsided only after the passage of the immigration-limiting Johnson Act of 1924. In that year their numbers totaled 4,228,027, and by 1937 they increased to 4,770,649 or 3.69 per cent of the population. Nine per cent of American college students in 1937, however, were Jewish or 2.47 times the proportion of Jews in the total population.[7]

1. Kohler, 1950: 86
2. Peters, 1905: 115.1
3. Slosson, 1921: 127.7
4. Jacobs, 1905: 83
5. Morison, 1937: 106.5
6. Peters, 1905: 115.1
7. Levinger, 1937: 92

During all periods of American higher educational history Jews have almost entirely attended the schools and colleges available to the population at large. The institutions they founded themselves were designed primarily for the training of their professional, religious personnel. Efforts were made to establish a Jewish college in 1840 by Mordecai M. Noah, in 1855 by I. M. Wise, and in 1867 by Isaac Leeser. All of them failed. In 1875, near the close of this period, the Hebrew Union College of Cincinnati opened under the auspices of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.[1]

The Period of Expansion and Diversification: The 1819 Supreme Court decision in the Dartmouth College Case stands as the great legal landmark in establishing the distinction between public and private control of higher education. It took many years, however, before the distinction became clear in practice. Not until 1865, for example, did the Commonwealth of Massachusetts withdraw from participation in the government of Harvard.[2] Meanwhile the Dartmouth College Case decision opened the way for the founding of a multiplicity of colleges by competing religious sects. At the time of the Civil War,"practically all the colleges... were organized, supported, and in most cases controlled by religious interests."[3] Table Eleven shows the relative participation of various sects in the founding of the 182 permanent colleges established before the Civil War.

From 1860 to 1890 the Methodists and Presbyterians established at least 75 colleges and from 1850 to 1910 the Lutherans 40. By 1940, 739 church-related universities, colleges, and junior colleges existed in the United States with a total enrollment of 377,519 students.[4] In addition to the church-related institutions, from 1880 on there developed many private

1. Jacobs, 1905: 83
2. Morison, 1937: 106.6
3. Tewksbury, 1932: 136.5
4. Wickey, 1950: 150

TABLE ELEVEN

PERMANENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
ESTABLISHED BEFORE THE CIVIL WAR*

By Religious Groups**

Presbyterian	49
Methodist	34
Baptist	25
Congregational	21
Roman Catholic	14
Episcopalian	11
Lutheran	6
Disciples	5
German Reformed	4
Universalist	4
Friends	2
Unitarian	2
Christian	1
Dutch Reformed	1
United Brethren	1
Total less duplicates	155***

By Units of Civil Government

Municipalities	3
States	21
Total	24
Miscellaneous	3****
Grand Total	182

*Adapted from The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War by Donald G. Tewksbury, N.Y. Columbia University, Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 545 (1932), p. 90 et seq.

**Most of the institutions in this group were established by groups of individuals associated with the denominations to which the institutions are here credited. Thus the denominations had influence in them rather than control over them. Today most of them have long since dropped their denominational ties.

***Religious groups cooperated in the founding of a number of these institutions, each denomination having influence in them. Thus, for example, Beloit was established by a group made up of both Congregationalists and Presbyterians.

****These institutions were established jointly by a state and a denomination. Today one of them (Tulane) operates independently of both church and state, and two (Centenary College and Mississippi College) have become denominational institutions.

colleges without religious ties such as Johns Hopkins (1876) and state universities such as Virginia (1825), most of them making no discrimination among students because of religious affiliations. In 1940 these institutions constituted the majority of American colleges and universities.

Up until 1870, 30 permanent Roman Catholic colleges for men had been established. By 1930, 43 more had been added. The College of Notre Dame opened in 1895 as the first four-year Catholic college for women. By 1930 75 others had opened. Enrollment in these colleges for men and in others for women had grown rapidly--121.6 per cent from 1910 to 1920 and another 121 per cent from 1920 to 1930.[1] Despite the active role in American higher education taken by the Roman Catholic Church, however, many Roman Catholic students attend non-Roman Catholic institutions.

As has been pointed out earlier, the Hebrew Union College, a theological school, opened in 1875 as the first permanent Jewish higher educational institution. The Jewish Theological Seminary (1886) and Gratz College (1893) were later developments.[2] By 1940 six training schools for rabbis, nine schools for religious teachers, a training school for Jewish social workers, and numerous colleges and institutes for adult Jewish study had been organized. Perhaps the only really lay college was Dropsie College in Philadelphia for advanced Jewish studies.[3] The very great majority of Jewish students have always attended non-Jewish colleges and universities.

The Present Scene: In 1947 a total of 779 church-related universities, colleges, and junior colleges existed in the United States. Of these Protestant [illegible]s controlled 550.[4] Twenty-three universities, 56 colleges for men, and [illegible]lleges for women operate under Roman Catholic auspices.[5] The only

1. [illegible], 1937: 18.2
2. Jacobs, 1905: 83
3. Chipkin, 1940: 21
4. Wickey, 1950: 150
5. Hochwalt, 1950: 59

important addition to Jewish higher education in the present period has been Brandeis University founded in 1948. Enrollment figures for 726 church-related institutions of higher education reporting in 1947 totaled 668,237.[1] This is a small portion of the almost two and a half million students in college that year.

Data turned up by recent regional and national studies have made it clear that discrimination at the college level exists especially against Jewish youth and somewhat against Roman Catholics. State-supported institutions apparently do not discriminate against either group when applicants are local residents, but they do discriminate against Jewish students from other states.[2] Both Jews and Roman Catholics make up for having smaller percentages of their applications accepted by submitting a larger number of applications than do Protestants, and hence Jewish and Roman Catholic students succeed in getting into college about as often as do Protestant students.[3]

5. Place of Residence

In the opening section of The American Language: Supplement Two H. L. Mencken quoted a tribute of The London Times to the effect that Noah Webster "was in his own sphere as much the founder of his nation as Washington."[4] Webster earned this acclaim because of his huge influence in nationalizing the American language. Colleges and universities have also powerfully influenced the making of the American people into a cultural as well as economic and political whole, and they have been able to function here in part because many of them have attracted and continue to attract students from many parts of the country. The high points of the history of the geographic

1. Wickey, 1950: 150
2. American Council on Education, 1949: 5.2
3. American Council on Education, 1949: 5.3
4. Mencken, 1948: 102

source of students will here be inspected.

The Period of the Old American College: The original colleges were largely local institutions. According to James J. Walsh:

> These colleges drew their students from their immediate surroundings. Harvard and Yale drew their matriculants from the New England colonies with some from New York. Princeton's student body came mainly from New Jersey with a few from Pennsylvania and New York, mainly those for whom Presbyterianism was the source of attraction, and the Presbyterian element in Philadelphia contributed largely to the college roster. The College of Philadelphia drew from the lower counties of Pennsylvania but some were attracted also to William and Mary in Virginia where they might be expected to go because that institution was under the discipline of the established Anglican Church.1

Students who came from other than the immediate area of the college came mostly for religious reasons. Those who lived in areas where no college existed either traveled far from home to a college of the family's religious faith or did not go to college. The majority chose the latter course. An occasional critic deplored the lack of educational opportunities in rural areas or criticized the localism of the colleges, but it remained for the great growth of higher education during the period of expansion and diversification to point up geographic differences in college opportunity.

Although the Old American College was predominantly a local institution, some of the New England colleges began early to attract a few students from other parts of the country and also from abroad. In the seventeenth century Harvard had students "from Bermuda, Virginia, and New Amsterdam as well as from England"; from other sections of the country in 1845 Yale had 201 students, Harvard 103, and four other New England colleges 146.[2] New England colleges became nationally known early in their histories and continue to attract many of their students from distant sources.

1. Walsh, 1935: 145.2

2. Morison, 1937: 106.8

The Period of Expansion and Diversification: The growth of numbers of colleges and universities and of enrollments during this period affected the geographic source of students in three especially important ways: some undergraduate colleges became well enough known to attract students from other parts of the country; the new universities which emphasized research also transcended geographic boundaries; and urban colleges grew in number and in size to serve increasing numbers of local students.

Antioch College and Swarthmore College typify the colleges outside of New England which have developed national clienteles. Johns Hopkins, the University of Chicago, and a few of the leading state universities also attract students from all over the nation as well as from abroad; and in a measure all of the approximately 100 universities which came during this period to offer Ph.D. programs draw students from wide sources. Meanwhile, urban institutions such as the College of the City of New York, the University of Cincinnati, and Wayne University in Detroit became more and more important and counteracted the away-from-home trend. In 1928 Parke R. Kolbe pointed out that the 145 institutions of higher education located in cities (among a national total of 913) enrolled nearly 270,000, or 40 per cent, of the 664,226 college and university enrollees of that year.[1]

Thus two forces operated during this period: one took students away from home for their college work and especially for their university work, the other kept them at home in local and especially in urban institutions.

The Present Scene: The geographic factor in college attendance intermingles closely with the economic factor. In general all but the affluent study in colleges and universities near their residences if not directly at hand. Even the nationally famous institutions draw the majority of their students

1. Kolbe, 1928: 87

from their immediate environs. These facts have had much to do with the growth of urban institutions and also of state universities, state colleges, and junior colleges. They have led educational reformers to demand that more colleges and universities be established in sections of the country--especially in the South--where their numbers are lower than in other sections.

Similarly the geographic factor intermingles with racial and religious factors. Local institutions, particularly if financed and controlled by civil government, cannot easily discriminate against Negroes, Jews, Roman Catholics, and other minority groups. Many who campaign actively for better equality of educational opportunity seem to believe that their chief hope of success lies in the localization of higher education. On the other hand, some educators believe that it would be undesirable to localize all higher education because they feel that this would lead to a dangerous provincialism.[1]

6. Socioeconomic Status

Education has always been a social elevator. This has been particularly true for Americans who have supported education, some believe, for this reason above all others. Yet in all periods critics of the colleges have condemned them for giving so much of their attention to the members of social and economic upper classes. This section explores the facts of the controversy.

The Period of the Old American College: The Old American College has been damned as an "aristocratic institution" and praised as a "seedbed of democracy." As in most disputes of this kind, evidence can be arrayed in support of either contention. It can be appraised only by reviewing the relevant

1. Berkowitz, 1948: 8.31

history, especially of colonial times:

> Inasmuch as the colonists were steeped in the social traditions of Europe and because the economic forces active there also operated in America, the settlers tended to duplicate the social structure of the Old World, ...the upper class, the middle class, and the propertyless working class....[1]

Very few of the colonists belonged to the self-conscious upper class which consisted of the larger landowners, the wealthier merchants, and the royal and proprietary governors and their immediate staffs. These few controlled money or land extensive enough to support a luxurious standard of living; and they spent most of their time in governmental, military, and intellectual pursuits. The middle class included clergymen and teachers, lesser merchants, officials of the Crown and of the proprietors, clerks of rich merchants, overseers of plantations, ships captains, and certain farmers and artisans. These did not have sufficient money to allow them the luxury of idleness, but they did own property or control the work of others. They also had suffrage rights. Members of the lower class were set apart from all others in the colonies because they did not own property, were not allowed to vote, and were dependent on others for employment. They included nomad farmers or "squatters," tenant farmers, traveling artisans, wage-earners such as dock and farm hands, indentured servants, and slaves.[2]

Under American frontier conditions, however, the order of things changed constantly. As Voltaire wrote, "History is full of the sound of wooden shoes going upstairs and the patter of silken slippers coming downstairs."[3] By the end of the period of the Old American college, royalty and its representatives at the upper end of the scale and indentured servants and slaves at the lower end had long since disappeared. Various kinds

1. Nettels, 1938: 109.1
2. Nettels, 1948: 109.2
3. Beard, 1944: 6.1

of technicians and artisans had moved up the social scale, and merchants and manufacturers had grown tremendously in numbers and had risen to commanding social status.

Throughout this entire period, however, the college attracted much the same kind of student personnel. To put it briefly, the student body of the Old American College usually consisted of a few members of the upper class, a great number of representatives of the higher levels of the middle class, and a few youths from the lower-middle and lower classes. Two exceptions that might well be noted are Princeton, which from the very beginning attracted many sons of wealthy Southern planters and other well-to-do persons,[1] and Dartmouth which made continued attempts to educate Indians and many poor white students free of charge.[2]

A revealing practice of the Old American College during the colonial period involved the ranking of students within each class. It has been asserted by many writers that students were ranked purely in terms of their fathers' social positions in the community. Morison, however, has found that during the eighteenth century many factors influenced the student's position within his class:

> In the eighteenth century ranking by intellectual merit gave way to ranking freshmen by "the Degrees of their ancestors"; but whether this was a gradual evolution from the merit system, as influenced by provincial precedence, or whether it was an importation from Yale, is still obscure. There are, to be sure, some traces of other values than scholastic merit at an earlier period. Brothers in the same class, possibly as a concession to family peace, were (with two exceptions) placed together, and always in the order of their ages. And the freshman seniority, except as altered by punishments, casualties, or late arrivals, went onto the printed Commencement theses, and into the triennial catalogue of graduates. Even those who failed to take a second degree were left undisturbed in the seniority that they enjoyed when commencing B. A. Hence, no effort on a student's part could improve his permanent rank; but neglect of scholastic exercises could, and

1. Tichnor, 1909: 138

2. Richardson, 1932: 121.2

> frequently did, impair this greatly prized privilege. But there is nothing incompatible with a merit system in the fact that so many Bulkeleys, Chauncys, Cottons, Denisons, Dudleys, Eliots, Mathers, Saltonstalls, Shepards, Symmes, and Winthrops enjoyed high seniority in the puritan century. These were families of energy and ability who were expected to show intellectual distinction from one generation to another, and seldom disappointed that expectation.[1]

Yale and perhaps other colleges followed this same practice of ranking. In fact, at Yale one bright but socially underprivileged student, the son of a shoemaker, is alleged to have obtained a high ranking by answering that his father was on the bench.[2] By the time of the Revolution, however, the practice of ranking the students had been abandoned.

Generally speaking, the following description of Harvard students during the eighteenth century applied to all colonial college students:

> Socially, the College was fairly representative of the upper layers of New England. Merchants, magistrates, and ministers furnished the larger number, but there were a good many sons of plain farmers and artisans, as the town and country parsons made it their business to shape up poor but promising lads for "university learning"; and there were now plenty of scholarships and exhibitions to pay all or part of a student's expense.[3]

Of 300 Harvard students (1673 to 1703) 79 were sons of ministers; 34 of magistrates and lawyers; 45 of merchants, shopkeepers and mariners; seven of physicians and schoolmasters; 28 of wealthy farmers and militia officers. Or, as Morison indicated, "...64 per cent of the student body from 1637 to 1703 came from the gentry and the propertied classes."[4] Thus, in this early period about two-thirds of Harvard students were drawn from the upper and middle classes. This does not give much ground for the assertion that the Old American College was exclusively or even predominantly an upper-class institution.

As for the lower class, during this same period Harvard enrolled 11

1. Morison, 1936: 105.5
2. Smith, 1898: 128
3. Morison, 1937: 106.7
4. Morison, 1936: 105.1

sons of ordinary farmers; 31 sons of artisans, seamen, and servants; and 65 students whose fathers' occupations are unknown but who probably did lower-class work.[1] In other words, 36 per cent of the students during this time came from the homes of persons who owned little or no property.

As has been indicated, many sons of the extremely wealthy did not attend the Old American College, at least during the colonial period. Many upper-class families sent their children to school in Europe. George Washington, urging the development of a national university in his last will and testament, wrote on this score:

> It has always been a source of serious regret with me, to see the youth of these United States sent to foreign countries for the purpose of education...[2]

Well-to-do men, especially Southerners, often sent their boys to school and colleges in England. In fact, Slosson estimated that if the voyage to England had not been so long, costly, and hazardous, several of the colonial colleges might never have been founded.[3]

Other members of the upper class did not go to college at all but apprenticed themselves into one of the learned professions.[4] Those youthful members of the better families who did not go to Europe or early enter one of the professions ordinarily attended the Old American College for "intellectual discipline" and "intellectual adornments." Among the upper-class students at Harvard in the early days were Samuel Bellingham (1642), Samuel Eaton (1649), Samuel Willis (1653), Samuel Bradstreet (1653), and John Haynes (1656), whose fathers were governors; Henry Saltonstall (1642) and William Mildmay (1646), whose fathers were knights; and Edward Rawson (1653), son of the secretary of the colony.[5] In the first 50 years of Yale were

1. Morison, 1936: 105.6
2. Ford, 1893: 52
3. Slosson, 1921: 127.8
4. Wertenbaker, 1946: 148.1
5. Sibley, 1873: 126

John Hart (1703), son of the speaker of the house; Samuel Hall (1716), whose father was governor's assistant; George Wyllys (1729), whose father was secretary of the colony; and Alexander Wolcott (1731) and Samuel Talcott (1733), whose fathers were governors.[1]

Sons of ministers made up the largest group in the Old American College during most of this period. As John Cotton expressed it, "nothing is cheap in New England but milk and ministers," and the ministers usually had large families.[2] Other students of middle-class background included sons of merchants, clerks, overseers, military and naval officers, and some farmers and artisans. In almost every college class there appeared a student or two who probably came from a lower-middle class or lower class home. Among the early students at Harvard were John Russell (1645), son of a glazier; Joshua Moodey (1653), son of a saddler; John Emerson (1656), whose father was a baker; and Elisha Cooke (1657), whose father was a tailor.[3] At Yale were John Beach (1721), son of a tailor; Henry Canter (1724) and Richard Canter (1736), whose father was a master carpenter; Walter Wilmot (1735), son of a carpenter; David Wooster (1738), son of a mason; Thomas Darling (1740), whose father was a cordwainer or cobbler; and William Throop (1743), whose father was a saddler.[4]

Many of these students helped themselves through college by part-time work. Also, the cost of attending college during this period was extremely low. "Throughout this period the expenses of the ordinary student," wrote Thwing, "were of an amount commensurate with the expense of living in the ordinary home..."[5]

In spite of all this, no cases can be found where any indentured servants or slaves attended the Old American College. The difficulties here

1. Dexter, 1885: 43
2. Richardson, 1932: 121.3
3. Sibley, 1873: 126
4. Dexter, 1885: 43.1
5. Thwing, 1906: 139.4

were almost insurmountable. In one instance, at least, John Wise, son of an indentured servant, attended Harvard, "...from servant to savant in two generations."[1]

It should be pointed out, however, that many members of what here is called the middle class were very poor by present-day standards. They were farmers who owned small plots of land or artisans who owned small shops. Their sons would not have been able to attend college under ordinary circumstances. James Russell Lowell described the method by which many of these poor but able boys were given the opportunity to attend Harvard:

> ...if a boy in any country village showed uncommon parts, the clergyman was sure to hear of it. He and the squire and the doctor, if there was one, talked it over, and that boy was sure to be helped onward to college; for next to the five points of Calvinism our ancestors believed in a college education....[2]

The education thus obtained was considered to be well worth the sacrifice involved for the boy concerned and his family. According to Morison:

> A century ago, the Harvard and Yale Triennial Catalogues, or both, were on the desk of every gentleman and scholar in New England. If your name was in it, that's who you were. If your name was not in it, who were you?[3]

The Period of Expansion and Diversification: From the beginning of this period higher education became available to new kinds of young people as witness the tremendous increase in enrollment shown in Table Eight. The greater part of this increase, however, occurred in the newer institutions --in the state universities, land-grant colleges, and the technical schools. A comparison of the attendance at 15 state universities and 15 representative eastern colleges and universities shows that the state universities had an enrollment of 16,414 in 1896-97 as compared with 34,770 in 1906-07, or an

1. Beard, 1944: 6.2
2. Lowell, 1887: 95.2
3. Morison, 1936: 105.1

increase of 112 per cent and that the eastern institutions had an enrollment of 18,331 in 1896-97 as compared with 28,631 in 1906-07, or an increase of 56 per cent.[1]

The main reason for this diverse development lay in the difference between the cultural education of the Old American College and the utilitarian offerings of the newer types of institutions. Immediate economic factors also were important. These newly-developing institutions usually admitted any high school graduate, charged low tuition fees or none at all, and operated as non-residential institutions. Harvard, Princeton, Yale, and other eastern representatives of the Old American College period continued to be highly selective, relatively expensive, and for the most part residential.

Before long the private institutions came under attack as "rich men's colleges." Speaking at Yale in 1896 William Jennings Bryan, the Great Commoner, probably summed up the opinion of a large segment of the population when he charged that "ninety-nine out of a hundred of the students in this university are sons of the idle rich."[2] As a result of this unfavorable opinion, many presidents of traditional four-year liberal arts colleges began to answer back. At the very beginning of this period President Charles W. Eliot took a look at the family backgrounds of Harvard students for the previous six years and announced:

> A small proportion only of these families can be called rich; the greater part are neither rich nor poor; and the proportion of the poor, though small, quite equals that of the rich.[3]

Similar defensive statements were issued by President James McCosh of Princeton in 1869,[4] by President Timothy Dwight of Yale in 1903,[5] by President A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard in 1909,[6] and by many others continuing right up

1. Cooper, 1912: 39
2. Canby, 1936: 19.2
3. Eliot, 1876: 47
4. Wertenbaker, 1946: 148.2
5. Sharp, 1933: 124
6. Dwight, 1903: 45

to the present day. But no matter how much these presidents protested, a few of them had to admit that the proportion of wealthy students was increasing, despite the efforts of the institutions to prevent it.[1] No one seems to have studied the topic in the large state universities where probably the same trend has been in progress.

The state universities, however, have escaped this kind of criticism. Their position at the top of the public school system gave them the appearance of "poor men's colleges." Not until relatively recently has economic discrimination become apparent in these institutions too. First, secondary education came to be recognized as being selective, and in 1922 George S. Counts wrote a book on The Selective Character of American Secondary Education. Because many students dropped out before graduating from high school they never got the opportunity to attend college--free or otherwise. Secondly, although the numbers of students taking advantage of secondary education had increased tremendously over the years, the percentage of high school graduates attending college, since 1900 at least, has been decreasing.[2] Thirdly, although the state universities enrolled more students than the private colleges and universities, they graduated much smaller proportions of their numbers.[3]

Toward the end of the period of expansion and diversification various studies began to point out the extent of socioeconomic discrimination. In 1927 O. Edgar Reynolds, in a survey of 55 colleges and universities, found that 76 per cent of the fathers of college students were in four occupations--proprietary, professional service, agriculture, and managerial.[4] In a study of young high school graduates published in 1953 Margaret W. Moore

1. Wertenbaker, 1946: 148.3
2. U.S. Office of Education, 1940: 143
3. Strang, 1934: 134
4. Reynolds, 1927: 120

found that students whose fathers were from proprietary, professional, and managerial occupations made up 49.7 per cent of the college students surveyed.[1] In a 1937 follow-up study of a group of high school students of college calibre in Wisconsin Helen B. Goetsch reported that college opportunity decreased as median parental income decreased and that such opportunities fell off rather abruptly when the family income went below $2,000 a year. She also found a relation between parental income and the type and length of college course pursued.[2]

From these and other studies one may fairly conclude that almost all colleges and universities in this period tended to be predominantly middle class institutions with a slight bias in favor of the upper middle class. Warner, Havighurst, and Loeb made the generalization more specific in their description of "Old City High School":

> ...most of the upper-class students attend college but... they form only 7 per cent of the total graduating class. The upper-middle class makes up 28 per cent of the graduating class and 69 per cent of them go on to college, whereas the lower-middle class makes up 23 per cent of the graduating class and only 16 per cent of them go on to college. Stated another way, of all those who go on to college, the upper-class students constitute 14 per cent, and there are no lower-class students during this period who go on to college.[3]

The Present Scene: During the war service in the armed forces took many students away from colleges and universities who, had not war come, would have been in attendance. At the same time educational programs supported by the military forces brought other students into higher education who ordinarily would not have sought admission. After the war the G.I. Bill made it possible for large numbers of both these types of students to

1. Moore, 1933: 103
2. Goetsch, 1940: 55
3. Warner, et al, 1944: 146

attend college. It also aided a third type, namely, those who had not planned to go to college before the war and who had had no taste of college life during their military training but who possessed the ability to do college work and who could now matriculate because of the financial assistance provided by the Bill. The Bill aided all three types of students; and more than any other factor it contributed, everyone agrees, to the increase of students by over a million between 1939 and 1949--from 1,364,815 to 2,456,841, a rise of 80 per cent.

Many believe that such financial aid to students should be continued for the following reasons:

1. A large number of studies indicate that economic barriers prevent otherwise qualified students from continuing their formal education after high school.
2. Economic mobility, unless assisted by advanced education, seems to be decreasing; and thus higher education has become the main elevator in American life for moving up the socioeconomic ladder to its upper rungs.
3. Employment opportunities for youths under 20 are clearly lessening, and this leaves nothing for increasing numbers of high school graduates to do but to continue their education, enter military service, or remain idle.

The efforts made and being made to establish Federal aid to students on a permanent basis cannot be reported here. Instead this section must be summarized in the following statement: The facts presented belie the accusation that the Old American College served only the sons of the wealthy, but they also indicate that economic barriers to higher education have always existed and appear to many to be as acute now as they have ever been.

7. Educational Preparation of Students

Two chief factors join in preparing for college--college admission requirements and methods of getting ready to meet them. Both have changed very considerably over the history of American higher education and especially during the past century. The following scanning of this history shows the transition from simplicity to complexity that characterizes all seven of the topics discussed in this chapter.

The Period of the Old American College: The history of college entrance requirements in America began in 1642 with the formulation of the first statutes of Harvard College:

> When any Scholar is able to read Tully or such like classical Latin Author ex tempre, and make and speake true Latin in verse and prose, ...and decline perfectly the paradigms of nounes and verses in ye Greeke tongue, then may hee bee admitted into ye College, nor shall any claim admission before such qualifications.1

Up until the middle of the eighteenth century admission requirements evolved in three ways: a gradual increase in the Greek requirement and a corresponding decrease in the Latin requirement, the addition of arithmetic, and a tendency for entrance requirements to become specific and quantitative.[2] Arithmetic came in at Yale in 1745, Columbia in 1755, Brown and Williams in the 1790's, and Harvard shortly afterwards.[3] Before 1800 only three subjects were required for admission to college--Latin, Greek, and arithmetic.[4] Up until that time, as Slosson has written:

> The boy who had graduated from grammar school was expected to be able to read and write easy Latin and to know a little of Greek grammar. Did his knowledge extend to these points, he had satisfied the requirements for admission.... Nobody bothered to ask him whether he could add a column of figures twice and get the same answer both times, or name the principal rivers of New England, or even spell his native tongue correctly.[5]

1. Broome, 1903: 14.1
2. Broome, 1903: 14.2
3. Brown, 1911: 15.1
4. Broome, 1903: 14.3
5. Slosson, 1921: 127.9

Between 1800 and 1870 eight new subjects were added to college admission requirements: geography, English grammar, English composition, algebra, geometry, physical geography, ancient history, and United States history. Table Twelve shows when and where these subjects were first introduced. During this period the amount of Latin and Greek required for admission also increased. "The year 1870, or thereabouts," Edwin Broome has observed, "marks a natural transition in the history of college admission requirements."[1]

TABLE TWELVE

THE CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF THE INTRODUCTION OF COLLEGE ENTRANCE SUBJECTS*

Subject	Date	College
Latin and Greek	1640	Harvard
Arithmetic	1745	Yale
Geography	1807	Harvard
English Grammar	1819	Princeton
Algebra	1820	Harvard
Geometry	1844	Harvard
Ancient History	1847	Harvard and Michigan
Modern History (U.S.)	1869	Michigan
Physical Geography	1870	Michigan and Harvard
English Composition	1870	Princeton
Physical Science	1872	Harvard
English Literature	1874	Harvard
Modern Language	1875	Harvard

*These dates have been determined from statements in the laws and catalogues of the colleges mentioned. They may not indicate the first actual appearance of each subject as an admission requirement, but they show when the subject began to be taught in a leading college.

During the period of the Old American College boys had a choice of two main methods of preparing for college. They could attend one of the Latin grammar schools, or they could be prepared by a private tutor (usually the local minister). In addition, because of the relative scarcity of good

1. Broome, 1903: 14.4

preparatory schools and well-educated tutors, some of the colleges had to assume the task of preparing students for admission.[1] After the middle of the eighteenth century, however, a new type of secondary education began to develop:

> ...for a long period, which may roughly be indicated as lying between the Revolution and the Civil War, the Latin Grammar School remained as a survival of another age while the high school was gradually beginning to assume its place as part of the educational system of the nation. The private academy meanwhile provided the link between elementary school and college.[2]

The academies offered a great variety of subjects and were partially responsible for the changes brought about in college admission requirements from 1800 to 1870. They were considered to be terminal institutions, however, and not preparatory schools for boys wanting to go to college.[3]

Both admission requirements and methods of preparation during the period of the Old American College selected a certain type of student. In Mr. Cowley's words:

> ...the early colleges accepted from England without question the assumption that higher education is for the aristocracy--the aristocracy of brains if not of purse--and thus restricted the clientele of American higher education until the rise of democratic sentiment in the nineteenth century....[4]

The "aristocracy of brains" meant students who had the verbal ability necessary for Greek and Latin and other literary subjects.

The Period of Expansion and Diversification: New subjects added to the list of college requirements for admission after 1870 included English literature, French, German, and natural sciences. (See Table Twelve.) From the beginning of this period on, however, no one college could possibly require all the subjects being added to the list. With the spread of the elective

1. Wilcox, 1936: 151.2
2. Slosson, 1921: 127.10
3. Brown, 1911: 15.2
4. Cowley, 1939: 40.1

principle, therefore, considerable flexibility in admission requirements developed. By 1900 the amount of Latin to be read had decreased, the amount of Greek had increased slightly (and only temporarily), and the requirements in mathematics and history had increased greatly.[1]

Other important developments during this period included the inspection and accreditation of secondary schools, the organization of the College Entrance Examination Board in 1900, and the adoption of the Carnegie unit in 1909--a pattern of admissions which dominated higher education until only just recently.[2] A 1931 study of 287 colleges and universities indicated that the following methods of admission were used: (1) presentation of high school diplomas--32, (2) entrance examination only--21, (3) certificate--259, (4) examination for students who did not qualify for entrance by certificate--229, (5) combination of certificate and examination--45, and (6) admission on basis of maturity--132.[3]

This period also saw the gradual disappearance of the academies and the rapid growth of the public high schools. By 1890 about 2500 of these publicly financed secondary schools had been organized, and by 1935 their numbers had increased to 28,000. The early high schools performed functions similar to those of the academies, but gradually they took on the function of preparing students for college. As more and more students came into the public schools, many of them not planning to attend college, a conflict in aims developed and became aggravated, resulting in a problem of articulation between the high school and the college.[4] Not all students going to college, however, prepared themselves in the public high schools. Until 1900 at least half the students enrolled in colleges in the United States were

1. Broome, 1903: 14.5
2. Sprouse, 1950: 131
3. Kurani, 1931: 90
4. Drake and Kronenberg, 1950: 44

classified as non-collegiate (preparatory) students. Not until 1915-16 did the colleges begin in earnest to eliminate these students and to turn over the preparatory function to the secondary schools.[1]

The change from a restricted, uniform pattern of course requirements to a vast, complex variety of requirements and admission techniques and the change from a selected few students prepared by Latin grammar schools or by private tutors to a huge enrollment of students coming mostly from the public high schools--these changes indicate profound alterations in the nature of student personnel. Mr. Cowley has summed up this transformation:

> Because of the rise of democracy, the impact of machine technology, and the growth of scientific knowledge and its results, the clientele of American higher education has changed from a constituency of pre-professional students to a constituency which includes students of many levels of ability with scores of divergent career objectives.[2]

The Present Scene: The many studies made of admission requirements today indicate that a majority of colleges and universities select students on the basis of the following criteria: (1) graduation from an accredited secondary school; (2) average of the secondary-school marks or rank in graduating class; (3) recommendations of principal or teachers; (4) aptitude, achievement, and psychological test scores; (5) personal interviews; and (6) evidence of good moral character.

Because of the extreme variability in admission practices and the fact that no one type of program is demanded for college admission, the secondary schools are concentrating more and more on "preparation for life." Results of investigations such as the Eight-Year Study have convinced many colleges that performance in high school and not the program followed determines whether or not a student will succeed.[3]

1. Wilcox, 1936: 151.2
2. Cowley, 1939: 40.2
3. Aikin, 1942: 4

Contrary to the belief that colleges and universities attract and select the ablest high school graduates, recent research has shown that large numbers with adequate ability do not attend college and that many college students "might be replaced by more appropriate intellectual investments."[1] Most institutions of higher education maintain standards of admission, however, which give them entering classes superior to the average of high school graduates.[2]

Summary

Large and far-reaching changes have occurred in the student personnel of American colleges and universities over the three periods just surveyed. The general trend of these changes has been from small, relatively uniform student bodies to huge, diversified groups of students. During the period of the Old American College students were fairly young, all men, predominantly white, mostly of Protestant faiths, generally of the upper-middle class, usually from the immediate surroundings, and largely selected in terms of ability in the verbal studies.

With the expansion and diversification of the functions and structures of higher education that occurred during the second period came a corresponding expansion and diversification in student personnel. Women, Negroes, Roman Catholics, Jews, students from the lower-middle class, and youths from different regions with different kinds of educational preparation and with different abilities and career objectives have swarmed into colleges and universities. In sum, American higher education during the past century and especially during recent decades has been steadily democratized.

1. Learned and Wood, 1938: 91

2. Williamson, 1935: 153